

Applicant : Stephan R. Yhann, et al
Serial No. : 10/786,771
Filed : February 25, 2004
Page : 7 of 11

JUL 05 2006
Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-634001 / P587

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 were pending as of the action mailed on May 4, 2006.

Claims 1, 11, 15, 22, and 24 are being amended, and claims 27-28 are new claims.

Support for the new claims can be found at least at page 13, line 24 to page 14, line 12 and at page 15, line 15 to page 16, line 25. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Section 103

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-14, 16, 18-24, and 26 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,462 ("Yoshino") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,331 ("Hollinger"). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Yoshino discloses a method of trapping an image that can effectively merge multiple adjoining objects into a single larger object. *See* column 5, line 52 to column 6, line 42. The adjoining objects are merged when a density difference (*i.e.*, a difference in color component values) between the adjoining objects is below a threshold. *See* column 5, line 55 to column 6, line 4. The single larger object is used when trapping the image, rather than trapping the adjoining objects individually. *See* column 6, lines 50-55.

Hollinger describes a system for decomposing a raster image into raster image data and vector data to create a composite image. *See* Hollinger, abstract. An edge is detected in the raster image, and a vector image of the detected edge is generated. *See* Hollinger, column 3, lines 13-20. The edge information can be removed from the raster image to reduce the storage needed for the raster image. *See* Hollinger, column 3, lines 33-38. The raster image and the vector image are stored as a composite image. *See* Hollinger, column 3, lines 39-45. When the composite image is printed or displayed, the vector image is rasterized and combined with the raster image. *See* Hollinger, column 3, lines 46-53.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that a rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have an original type differs from a corresponding rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have a transformed type. Claim 1 also recites

Applicant : Stephan R. Yham, et al.
Serial No. : 10/786,771
Filed : February 25, 2004
Page : 8 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-634001 / P587

that a transformed graphical element that has the transformed type is processed using the rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have the original type.

The Examiner states, "Yoshino doesn't describe that a rule associated with processing of graphical elements having the original type differs from a corresponding rule associated with processing of graphical elements having the transformed type." The Examiner asserts, however, that in Hollinger:

The processing algorithms, or rules, applied to a composite raster-vector image during image manipulations such as rotating and scaling are drastically different from the processing algorithms, or rules, applied to a raster image during the same manipulations, therefore the composite image, which is considered an image having a transformed type, will have very different processing rules applied to it when compared to the processing rules applied to the original raster image, which is considered an image having an original type.

Under the Examiner's reading of Hollinger, the limitations of amended claim 1 discussed above require that Hollinger use a rule when processing his "transformed" composite raster-vector image that also is applied when processing an untransformed raster image, but that differs from a corresponding rule applied when processing an untransformed composite raster-vector image. The Examiner stated, however, that in Hollinger "the processing algorithms, or rules, applied to a composite raster vector image during image manipulations ... are drastically different from the processing algorithms, or rules, applied to a raster image during the same manipulations." Hollinger does not, therefore, disclose or suggest the limitations of amended claim 1.

Neither Yoshino nor Hollinger, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest that a rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have an original type differs from a corresponding rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have a transformed type and that a transformed graphical element having the transformed type is processed using the rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have the original type.

Applicant : Stephan R. Yhann, et al.
Serial No. : 10/786,771
Filed : February 25, 2004
Page : 9 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-634001 / P587

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-5, 7-8, 11-14, 16, and 18-21 are allowable over the combination of Yoshino and Hollinger. Claim 22 includes limitations similar to those of claim 1. Claim 22 and dependent claims 23-24 and 26 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 6, 9, 17, and 25 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshino in view of Hollinger and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,030 ("Ahlstrom"). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Ahlstrom discloses a method of automatically calculating traps for objects in a native desktop publishing application. *See* column 1, lines 9-12. A first object is trapped against other objects by decomposing the first object into object components, self-trapping the object components against each other to generate trap segments, and trapping the trap segments against the other objects. *See* column 3, lines 3-25.

Ahlstrom, alone or when combined with Yoshino and Hollinger, does not disclose or suggest that a rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have an original type differs from a corresponding rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have a transformed type and that a transformed graphical element having the transformed type is processed using the rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have the original type.

For at least this reason, claims 6, 9, 17, and 25 are allowable over the combination of Yoshino, Hollinger, and Ahlstrom.

Claim 10 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshino in view of Hollinger and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0214534 ("Uemura"). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Uemura discloses a method of displaying data items in a manner that indicates both the importance and the urgency of the data items. *See* abstract.

Uemura, alone or when combined with Yoshino and Hollinger, does not disclose or suggest that a rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have an original type differs from a corresponding rule applied when processing untransformed graphical

Applicant : Stephan R. Yhann, et al.
Serial No. : 10/786,771
Filed : February 25, 2004
Page : 10 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-634001 / P587

elements that have a transformed type and that a transformed graphical element having the transformed type is processed using the rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have the original type.

For at least this reason, claim 10 is allowable over the combination of Yoshino, Hollinger, and Uemura.

Claim 15 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshino in view of Hollinger and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0141194 ("Gupta"). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Gupta discloses a method of reducing the amount of ink or toner used to print a color document using halftoning. See ¶1.

Gupta, alone or when combined with Yoshino and Hollinger, does not disclose or suggest that a rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have an original type differs from a corresponding rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have a transformed type and that a transformed graphical element having the transformed type is processed using the rule applied when processing untransformed graphical elements that have the original type.

For at least this reason, claim 15 is allowable over the combination of Yoshino, Hollinger, and Gupta.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce in other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

JUL 05 2006


Applicant : Stephan R. Yhann, et al.
Serial No. : 10/786,771
Filed : February 25, 2004
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-634001 / P587

Please charge \$100 for excess claim fees, and apply any other charges or credits, to
deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 5, 2006


Clinton Martin
Reg. No. 56,407

Customer No.: 21876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50350734.doc